

## **Remarks**

Claims 1 and 45-65 are pending in the Application. Claims 64-65 have been added. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendment can be found in previous claims and in the Specification, e.g., page 60, lines 13-20 and page 61, lines 7-10. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

## **The Claim Rejections**

Claim 49 was rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Awatsu (US 5,900,607).

Claims 1, 45-48, 53, 55-59, and 61-62 were rejected as obvious pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Awatsu in view of Kasper (US 6,257,154).

Claims 54 and 60 were rejected as obvious pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Awatsu in view of Kasper and Black (US 6,789,354).

Claims 50-52 and 63 were rejected as obvious pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Awatsu in view of Kasper and Kuel (GB 2,202,066).

## **Claim 1**

The Action alleges that Awatsu's cash safe (2) constitutes a cassette. However, Awatsu specifically differentiates the cash safe (2) from the acknowledged cassettes (60, 61). That is, Awatsu admits that the cash safe (2) is not a cassette. The Action is silent regarding Awatsu's disclosed differentiation.

Awatsu's card content is read by a card reader (26), then checked against a PIN entered by keys (28) to confirm whether the user is authorized (col. 20, lines 19-35). Later, if the authorized user selects cash setting (in step S33), then a process is triggered to enable unlocking of the cash safe door (25) (in step S34) (col. 20, lines 32-42). Step S34 depends on step S33 (Figure 32A).

Kasper is non analogous art. Kasper is directed to a mechanical lock. Where does Kasper teach or suggest an electronic lock? Where does Kasper teach or suggest an automated banking machine *chest*?

The references, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the recited features and relationships. The references do not teach or suggest the ability to use a lock combination stored in a cassette's memory to unlock the cassette. The relied upon Awatsu does not teach or suggest storing lock combination data in cassette memory. As previously noted, Awatsu uses data stored on a card, not data stored in cassette memory.

Nor do the references teach or suggest the structure and ability to retrieve the stored lock combination from the cassette memory for use in unlocking a cassette. Where does the relied upon Awatsu teach or suggest retrieving lock combination data from cassette memory in cassette unlocking?

The references further do not teach or suggest the structure and ability to unlock a cassette responsive to a retrieved lock combination corresponding to user input received with a keypad.

Kasper cannot alleviate the deficiencies of Awatsu. The Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

### **Claim 49**

Applicants' previous remarks regarding the patentability of claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. Again, Awatsu admits that the cash safe (2) is not a cassette. Awatsu does not anticipate claim 49.

The Action alleges that Awatsu's key input section (28) constitutes an electronic lock control. The Action further alleges that this key input section (28) includes an electronic programmable combination receiving member that can receive a lock combination; is operative to move a locking member to an unlocked position; and is operative to receive input via the combination receiving member to change the lock combination. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

There is no evidence of record that the key input section (28) (i.e., the alleged electronic lock control) includes an electronic *programmable* combination receiving member. Awatsu does not anticipate claim 49.

There is no evidence of record that the key input section (28) (i.e., the alleged electronic lock control) can move a locking member to an unlocked position responsive to a combination entered into the combination receiving member (28). As previously discussed, Awatsu's card content is checked against a key-entered PIN to merely determine whether the user is authorized (col. 20, lines 19-35). This action does not cause the cash safe (2) to open. Rather, further input action is needed from the authorized user. That is, the user (after being authorized) next needs to select the cash setting in order to trigger the ability to unlock of the cash safe door (25) (col. 20, lines 32-42). Awatsu does not anticipate claim 49.

Where does Awatsu teach any ability to change a lock combination? There is no evidence that the key input section (28) (i.e., the alleged electronic lock control) is used to change the lock combination. As previously discussed, Awatsu's data is stored on a card. There is no evidence that the card data is changeable. Even if it were changeable, there is not evidence that it is changed by the key input section (28). What prevents the card data from being changed at a location remote from (and with a device other than) the key input section (28)? Awatsu's key input section (28) cannot constitute the recited electronic lock control. Nor can Awatsu anticipate claim 49.

#### **Claim 58**

For reasons of brevity, Applicants' previous remarks regarding the patentability of claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. The references, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the recited features and relationships.

The references do not teach or suggest storing a lock combination in memory inside a cassette; receiving an inputted combination; retrieving the stored combination; and unlocking the cassette responsive to the retrieved combination corresponding to the inputted combination. The Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

#### **The Dependent Claims**

Each of the dependent claims depends directly or indirectly from an independent claim. The Applicants have shown the independent claims to be allowable. Thus, it is asserted that the dependent claims are allowable on the same basis. Furthermore, each dependent claim

additionally recites specific features and relationships that further patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the applied art.

The references, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features and relationships that are specifically recited in these claims. For example, with regard to claim 64, where do the references teach or suggest the structure and ability to unlock a cassette multiple times using the same retrieved lock combination? Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are further allowable due to the recitation of such additional features and relationships.

#### Fee For Additional Claims

Please charge the fee associated with the submission of two excess total claims (\$100) and any other fee due to Deposit Account 09-0428.

#### Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance.

The undersigned is willing to discuss any aspect of the Application by telephone at the Office's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Ralph E. Jocke Reg. No. 31,029  
WALKER & JOCKE  
231 South Broadway  
Medina, Ohio 44256  
(330) 721-0000